

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated November 14, 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6-7, 10, 12, 15, and 19. Applicant submits that no new matter was added by these additions or amendments. Applicant has cancelled claims 2 and 11. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3, 4-9, 12-16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, claims 4, 6, and 8, 12, 15-16 and 19-20 were rejected for indefiniteness. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the term “an object identification” is indefinite. Claim 4 recites a second message that includes an object identification. The term “an object identification” may or may not refer to the same object identification that is included in the first message recited in claim 1. Consequently, it is unnecessary to specifically recite whether the object identification in claim 1 is the same or different than the object identification in claim 4. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Additionally, dependent claims 3, 6, 15, and 19 were rejected for lack of antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 3, 6, 15, and 19 to clarify the antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4, 10-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,475,817 issued to Waldo et al. (“*Waldo*”). Applicant respectfully submits that Waldo fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Nonetheless, Applicant

has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to further highlight the distinctions between the claims and the cited reference. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

With respect to amended claims 1 and 10, Waldo fails to teach verifying an existence of an action, according to the action identification, in the identified object in the second run-time environment. In fact, Waldo teaches away from verifying the existence of an action, according to the action identification. Waldo specifically states a requirement that “if an object class supports any operation in an interface, it *must* support all of the members of the set of operations that constitute that interface.” [col. 7, line 34-36] (emphasis added). Consequently, Waldo does not disclose a need to verify the existence of an action.

With Applicant’s invention, on the other hand, a particular object may or may not contain a particular action. If an object does not support a particular action, Applicant’s invention can return an error message, and the invention still functions. This behavior is enabled by the step of verifying an existence of an action, according to the action identification, in the identified object in the second run-time environment. Lines 1-5 of page 12 of Applicant’s application states:

In step verifying 402, interpreter 102 verifies the existence of the action in the identified object in the second run-time environment. In the first and second embodiments, steps 412 and 422, interpreter evaluates action identifier 116 and 126 and determines existence or non-existence of PROPERTY COLOR. In case of non-existence, interpreter 102 issues error message 192 (cf. FIG. 2). In the third embodiment, step 432, interpreter evaluates action identifier 136 and determines existence or non-existence of function CALCULATE.

The invention described in Waldo does not have the need or ability to verify an existence of an action, according to the action identification, in the identified object in the second run-time environment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and its dependents and claim 10 and its dependents.

Independent claim 17 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claims 1 and 10 discussed above. Therefore, these claims as well as their

dependents are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 10.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 5-9, 13-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldo as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 10-12 and 17. Applicant traverses these rejections and all findings and assertions therein. Among other things, these claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, or 17. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 10, and 17 are allowable over Waldo. Therefore, claims 3, 5-9, 13-16 and 18-20 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable claims 1, 10, and 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all claims.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Applicant : Wolfgang Pfeifer  
Serial No. : 10/788,901  
Filed : February 27, 2004  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney Docket No.: 13913-171US1/2001P00031WOUS

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2008

/Spencer C. Patterson/

Spencer C. Patterson

Reg. No. 43,849

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 747-5070  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

90264351.doc